# Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 2010-03-11 10:30:12

2. Agency: 007

3. Bureau: 57

4. Name of this Investment: Battle Control System Fixed

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 007-57-05-15-01-1854-00

- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?: Mixed Life Cycle
  - Planning
  - Full Acquisition
  - Operations and Maintenance
  - Mixed Life Cycle
  - Multi-Agency Collaboration
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? \*
- 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.

Battle Control System Fixed (BCS-F) is the cornerstone system for the North American Aerospace Defense Command/US Northern Command (NORAD/NORTHCOM) Homeland Defense mission. BCS-F provides 24 hours, 7 days a week, 365 days a year Command and Control (C2) mission support within the United States and Canada to include Alaska, Hawaii, US Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. Its five operational locations within the US and Canada execute surveillance, identification, data link operations, weapons control, and air battle management within their respective areas of operation. BCS-F supports other DoD and Governmental Agencies in support of various Homeland Security missions and civil relief operations. It conducts other Special Security Event missions (Super Bowl, Presidential Inaugurations, and other requirements) and is tasked with the protection of the President and Vice-President of the US. BCS-F conducts operations and provides tactical control for the defense of the National Capital Region mission. The delivered capabilities of BCS-F fill existing and emerging capability and performance gaps in command and control missions, Homeland and theater air defense, civil relief, airspace management, data link management, air surveillance, weapons control, and aircraft identification. Additionally, BCS-F enabled the cost-saving closure of one of three CONUS Air Defense Sectors, increased radar input capacity and area of coverage, and increased flight plan processing capacity. The upgrade of hardware and software components significantly increased system operational availability and stopped sustainment shortfalls created by diminishing resources.

- a. Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned)alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.
- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? \* a.If "yes," what was the date of this approval? \*
- 10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?
  - Name: \*
  - Phone Number: \*

• Email: \*

#### 11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? \*

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

## 12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

Financial management system name(s)	System acronym	Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number		
*	*	*		

- a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): \*
  - o computer system security requirement;
  - o internal control system requirement;
  - core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
  - Federal accounting standard;
  - U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
  - this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
  - Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

l.	Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)											
	PY1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011	BY+1 2012		BY+3 2014	BY+4 and beyond	Total			
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
SUBTOTAL	.: *	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
	G	Sovernment F	TE Costs she	ould not be in	ncluded in the	amounts pr	ovided above	э.				
Governmen FTE Costs	t *	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
TOTAL(incl uding FTE costs)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

\*

1

#### Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

۱. ا	Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table											
	Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordan ce with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order (M)	Is this an Interagen cy Acquisiti on? (Y/N)	Is it performa nce based? (Y/N)	Competit ively awarded ? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternativ e financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)
	Contract # FA8722-0 5-C-0003 BCS-F Spiral 3 Comman d and Control Software. Follow on contract award for improvem ents to point of departure Increment 2 system.	FFP, CPAF, CPIF	Y	2005-07-1	2005-07-1	2012-02-1	\$143.8	*	*	•	*	*
	Contract # FA8722-0 6-C-0001 BCS-F Interim Contracto r Support	CPFF, FFP	Y	2006-05-0	2006-05-0	2009-11-3	\$22.5	*	*	*	*	*

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?  $^{\ast}$ 

a.If "yes," what is the date? \*

#### Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table										
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results			
2009	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Spiral 3.1 Operational Testing (OT) results	Open Spiral 2 Category I A/B OT deficiencies and Category I C/D OT deficiencies	No open new Category I A,B, or C DT deficiencies and closure of 80 percent of Category I D DT deficiencies	One Category I C and two Category I D deficiencies are open on the system; however, the program office has initiated actions to resolve open deficiencies during the first Interim Contractor Support software delivery in the Spring of 2010.			
2009	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	•	Radar capacity and CONUS system coverage	Current sensor feed capacity average and required percentage of CONUS coverage by a single Air Defense Sector with no impact on system response time	Threshold sensor feed capacity and required percentage CONUS coverage by a single Air Defense Sector with no impact on system response time	Actual enabled capacity meets threshold values. Sites' upgraded processors support more data feeds with no performance impact			
2009	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Spiral 2 system Operational Availability	System-wide Operational Availability at threshold values	System-wide Operational Availability exceeding threshold values	System-wide Operational Availability exceeded threshold values			
2009	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	New Increment 3 server and workstation hardware	Installation complete at 3 US Air Defense Sectors	Installation complete at all 4 US Air Defense Sectors	Installation of new hardware is complete at all 4 US Air Defense Sectors			
2010	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Increment 3.1 system ability to execute all mission requirements at all sites	System declared Initially Operationally Capable	All 4 US sites declared operationally capable	TBD - Testing is ongoing. IOC is projected for 2nd Qtr FY10			
2010	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	٠	Distribution of tactical air picture via machine to machine interface	No Higher Headquarters (HHQ) sites receiving remote BCS-F tactical air picture	2 HHQ (NORAD and CONR) receiving tactical air picture	TBD - Testing is ongoing. IOC is projected for 2nd Qtr FY10			
2010	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Increment 3.1 system Operational Availability	System-wide Operational Availability at threshold values	System-wide Operational Availability exceeding threshold values	TBD; however, Increment 3.1 has exceeded threshold Operational Availability values			

		Tab	ole 1: Performano	ce Information Ta	able		
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
							throughout formal system testing.
2010	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	New Auxiliary Server Suites	Test facility and operational systems without Auxiliary Server Suites	Installation of the Auxiliary Server Suite at the test facility	TBD - Auxiliary Server Suite is installed at the government and contractor test facilities; however, it has not undergone formal testing.
2011	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Development and implementation of improved geographic model for Increment 3.2	Increment 3.1 geographic constraints	Successful Developmental Testing of new geographic model	TBD - Critical Design Reviews ongoing with contractor. First functional demonstrations to occur in December 2010
2011	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	٠	Increment 3.2 system processing capacity increases to new threshold values	Increment 3.1 system processing capacities	Meets Increment 3.2 system processing threshold values	TBD
2011	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Increment 3.1 system Operational Availability	System-wide Operational Availability at threshold values	System-wide Operational Availability exceeding threshold values	TBD
2011	Reshaping the Defense Enterprise	*	*	Ability for a single Air Defense Sector to expand its Area of Operations	Increment 3.1 Area of Operations limits	Expanded Area of Operations by a single Air Defense Sector	TBD

### Part II: Planning, Acquisition And Performance Information

Section A: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline										
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete		
BCS-F Increment 3.1 Initial Operational Capability at all four US Air Defense Sectors and one test facility. Major elements include new open operating systems and more powerful hardware. Delivers new Human Machine Interface - #1 user requirement	\$67.6	\$66.2	2005-07-13	2005-07-13	2010-02-19	2010-02-17	100.00%	100.00%		
BCS-F Increment 3.2 Initial Operational Capability at all four US Air Defense Sectors and one test facility. Major elements: additional Link 16 message sets and interoperabilit y improvements . Enables individual sites to cover a greater mission area.	\$77.2	\$32.1	2006-12-26	2006-12-26	2012-02-17		0.00%	42.00%		

<sup>\* -</sup> Indicates data is redacted.